Appln. No.: 09/531,534
Amendment dated January 26, 2006
Amendment responsive to Office Action mailed November 2, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action of November 2, 2005, has been carefully reviewed and this amendment is in response thereto. Applicant herein amends claims 1, 4, 5, 12, 20, and 28. Claims 1-35 are pending. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 12, 20, and 28-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ran et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,209,026, hereinafter Ran). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

In order to reject a claim as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102, a single prior art reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention. MPEP § 706.02. Applicants have amended claim 1 to clarify that the method of claim 1 is performed at a content server logically residing between a content provider and a user terminal, and that the content server updates only changed information to the user terminal.

On the other hand, unlike the claimed invention, Ran makes no mention that only changed information is sent to the user terminal. Ran indicates in various locations that it "sends back the processed personalized real-time traveler information ... to said user's internet pager or hand-held device." See, e.g., Ran, col. 11, lines 61-64; col. 12, lines 34-37; col. 12, lines 45-48. Applicant has amended claims 12, 20, and 28 to also clarify that only changed information is sent. Claims 2 and 29 are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3-4, 13, 15-17, 21, 23-25, 30, and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ran in view of Kondou (U.S. Pat. No. 6,073,075). These claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective based claims, and also in view of the additional features recited therein and based on the following arguments.

With respect to claims 3 and 30, Ran does not teach or suggest determining whether the plurality of real-time data values has changed, but instead merely "processes the requested real-time

Page 11 of 13

traveler information" and sends it back to the hand-held device. Ran makes no mention of how it is processed or what data is sent back to the hand-held device. Kondou does not cure this deficiency.

With respect to claim 4, Ran does not teach or suggest determining the position on a screen in the user terminal corresponding to the real-time data. The cited portion of Kondou states:

> FIG. 7 illustrates a service information reference screen of the mobile terminal 20. The present screen is composed of various windows which will be described next. First, a whole map window 701 will be described. This displays in a rough map all the areas related to the downloaded service information. The map is divided into blocks having a predetermined side length in which the present place (in this example, the starting point) and the destination are indicated. In addition, a block indicated by a detailed map window 702 to be described later is recognizable. The
>
> window 702 displays the detailed map of a block selected in the whole map window 701. Road information on the course to the destination and traffic jams are superimposed and displayed graphically on the map. A message window 703 displays textized service information. A menu window 704 displays control icons and retrieval information icons for a service information retrieval program as a program of the present mobile terminal 20. The control icons expresses by images the commands for executing the start-up and termination of the present program by selecting the appropriate ones of those icons.

This clearly does not equate to determining the position on a screen in the user terminal corresponding to the real-time data, as claimed. Rather, Kondou merely divides a map into regions, and displays various information in each region, which is different from the claimed method.

Claim 35 is similarly allowable for the reasons already discussed above. Dependent claims 13, 15-17, 21, and 23-25 are allowable at least based on their respective base claims.

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ran in view of Kondou and further in view of Tyra et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,442,565, hereinafter Tyra). Claim 5, however, is allowable for the same reasons as its respective base claim, as Tyra does not cure the deficiencies of Ran and Kondou already discussed above.

Claims 6-11, 14, 18-19, 22, 26-27, and 31-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ran in view of Kondou and further in view of De Boor et al. (U.S. Pat. No.

Appln. No.: 09/531,534
Amendment dated January 26, 2006
Amendment responsive to Office Action mailed November 2, 2005

6,173,316). These claims, however, are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims, as De Boor does not cure the deficiencies of Ran and Kondou already discussed above.

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3153.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated this 26th day of January, 2006   By: /Ross Dannenberg/
Ross Dannenberg, Registration No. 49,024
1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001

RAD/mmd